

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ·	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/615,070	07/08/2003	Koenraad Pringiers	610002-2000	7894
7590 09/08/2004			EXAMINER	
FROMMER I	LAWRENCE & HAUG	STORMER, RUSSELL D		
745 Fifth Avenue New York, NY 10151			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3617	
			DATE MAILED: 09/08/2004	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/615,070	PRINGIERS, KOENRAAD				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Russell D. Stormer	3617				
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RETHE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - If the period for reply specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by some Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the nearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply n. a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (3 priod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH tatute, cause the application to become ABAN	y be timely filed 30) days will be considered timely. S from the mailing date of this communication. IDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _						
· <u> </u>	This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for all	,—					
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☑ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the applica 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☑ Claim(s) 1-9 and 11-22 is/are rejected. 7) ☑ Claim(s) 10 is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	drawn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9)⊠ The specification is objected to by the Exar	miner.					
D)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>08 July 2004</u> is/are: a) accepted or b)⊠ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to	the drawing(s) be held in abeyance	e. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co	, , ,	•				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International But * See the attached detailed Office action for a	nents have been received. nents have been received in App priority documents have been re ireau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	olication No eceived in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)	_					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		nmary (PTO-413) Mail Date				
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948 Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SI Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/8/04. 	, — — — ·	rmal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 10/615,070 Page 2

Art Unit: 3617

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The reference to the GB-A-2104015 document in the specification fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each foreign patent; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. The reference was not included on the IDS filed July 8, 2003 and has not been considered.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the reinforcing element forming a loop around each of the first and second end part as set forth in claim 11, and the "intermediary piece" of claim 18 must be shown or the features canceled from the claims.

No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for

consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

- 3. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because of the use of the terms means and said. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).
- 4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: ***

 The spelling of terms such as "tyre" "minimise" "fibres" "characterised" and "in stead" must be corrected.

Appropriate correction is required.

5. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required:

There is no description of the reinforcing elements forming loops around the end parts of the track as set forth in claim 11; nor is there is description of the intermediary piece of claim 18.

Applicant should take care not to enter any new matter.

Application/Control Number: 10/615,070 Page 4

Art Unit: 3617

Claim Objections

6. Claims 8 and 18 are objected to because of the following informalities: In claim 8

the phrase "being aimed at" is confusing and not understood, and in claim 18 the phrase

"in view of" appears to be misplaced as it is not understood.

Appropriate correction is required.

7. The numbering of claims is not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126 which requires

the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution. When

claims are canceled, the remaining claims must not be renumbered. When new claims

are presented, they must be numbered consecutively beginning with the number

next following the highest numbered claims previously presented (whether

entered or not).

Claim 15 appears to have been added, or substituted for original claim 15, in the

preliminary amendment, which lists 22 claims. Only 21 claims are original.

Applicant's attention is directed to MPEP 608.01(j).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United

States.

Art Unit: 3617

9. Claims 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, and 22 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Svensson.

With respect to claim 5, note the projections 5 which are attached to the sides of the guiding wings 12.

With respect to claims 8 and 9, note the extensions of the members 16 and the recesses on the parts 18, and the sleeves 8 as shown in figure 2.

With respect to claims 11+, note the reinforcing wire 7 which loops around the sleeves 8.

With respect to claim 17, note the reinforcing elements 6.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 11. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Svensson in view of Slemmons.

The guiding wings of Svensson are not reinforced and do not clamp the wheel.

Slemmons teaches a track for a tractor comprising a pair of guiding wings 18 reinforced by a rigid core 24 and which exert a clamping force on the wheels 12, 13.

For the guiding wings 12 of Svensson to be arranged closer to the tires 2, 4 to provide a clamping force and also be reinforced by a rigid core would have been

Art Unit: 3617

obvious as taught by Slemmons in order to reduce the chances of the track coming off the wheels during use.

12. Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Svensson in view of Sinclair.

For the inner sides of the wings of Svensson to include profiles would have been obvious as taught by Sinclair (see the shape of the boss 8) in order to better interact with the tires 2, 4.

13. Claims 15 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Svensson.

To substitute another material for the steel wires 7, such as an aramid fiber, would have been obvious as such substitutions are well-known in the art in order to reduce the weight of the fibers and thus the track, and because such fibers can be made stronger than steel.

To supply the track assembly with an intermediary piece would have been obvious to those of ordinary skill in order to allow the track to be used on other tractors with longer wheelbases.

Allowable Subject Matter

14. Claim 10 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The references show other track assemblies.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Russell D. Stormer whose telephone number is (703) 308-3768. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 9 AM to 4 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joe Morano can be reached on (703) 308-0230. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 3617

9/3/04

RUSSELL D. STORMER
PRIMARY EXAMINER